

**University Assessment Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, October 2, 2013**  
**9:00-9:55a.m., Peace Garden Room, Memorial Union**

Present: Margaret (Peggy) Andersen, Jeffrey Boyer, Kevin Brooks, Julie Garden-Robinson, Brenda Hall, Chris McEwen, Jeremy Penn, Larry Peterson, Scott Pryor, Bruce Rafert, Brandy Randall, Elizabeth Skoy, and Bill Slanger. Recorder: Linda Dahlsad.

Unable to Attend: Ann Clapper, Andrew Montgomery, and Chad Ulven.

1. The minutes of the September 4, 2013 meeting were approved with a clarification that Mary Allen is a psychologist and nationally known author in the area of general education assessment.
2. Updated Mini progress Report Chart. We now have three undistributed reports received this fall. Because of the Provost's support, the backlog of late reports has been reduced dramatically in one year. Larry thanked everyone who volunteered to review a batch of reports, especially the last groups of reports that had been submitted, but which Larry had lost track of in his email.
3. Agenda change – moved Proposed GE assessment initiative to end of agenda.
4. Members discussed the report from the Reviewer Rubric Subcommittee.
  - a. Present Reviewer Rubric
    - i. The present one is designed to assess reports from Academic Affairs. It does not work well for Student Affairs. Student Affairs is working on a different report template addressing student retention. They are trying to answer how their Student Affairs programming is supporting retention and removing barriers to student learning.
      1. The alignment between the Student Affairs Learning Agenda and the University Learning Outcomes from CULE may be reinforced soon. On October 31 the Student Affairs Timely Topics sessions will explore how they are aligned. Penn, Peterson, and Erika Beseler Thompson will be making presentations.
    - ii. Some questions always get the same answer. Student learning is never undervalued.
    - iii. We do not ask for the right information to answer some of the present questions. We do not ask for an assessment plan with the date it was most recently revised. The rubric asks about the extent of faculty involvement, but for some assessment reports we have no sense of what the department looks like, how large it is or how many of the faculty were involved.
    - iv. The current rubric does not provide any aggregate or longitudinal data.
    - v. With the GDC system, Kelly or Larry needs to cut and paste the reviewer's responses into a Word document in order to send it to the departments.
  - b. Revising the Reviewer Rubric for Current Reports
    - i. The first five questions on the Evaluating Assessment Reports handouts from the IUPUI Assessment workshop are solid. We should use them.

- ii. The rubric guidelines changes will need to be made quickly, ideally completed in two weeks. The current rubric is usable enough that we should focus just on tweaking it at present.
      - iii. The subcommittee will work on it electronically.
      - iv. The immediate task is to complete one rubric for Academic Affairs and one for Student Affairs. There will be two rubrics, but with some common questions.
      - v. We will need to develop a third rubric for Extension.
    - c. Reviewer Rubric for 2013-14
      - i. This will be a different rubric because of the focus on reflecting about expected student learning or development in these reports.
    - d. Reviewer Rubric for 2014-15
      - i. We will ask departments to include their assessment plan with the date it was revised in the appendix.
    - e. Rubric Process and General Thoughts
      - i. Last year all departments were asked to submit their assessment plans to Peterson. The quality of the assessment plans varies greatly.
      - ii. In 1992 all departments completed "The Chart," an early version of an assessment plan. Those should be on file in Peterson's office.
      - iii. How can we encourage departments to discuss the feedback from the UAC?
      - iv. We should distribute copies of the rubric to departments ahead of time.
      - v. We need to be certain that our rubric matches with what we ask departments for in the guidelines.
5. Members discussed the report from the Department Guidelines Subcommittee
- a. Key or basic learning outcomes are ones where you would be embarrassed if a graduate from your program did not know or understand them.
  - b. We should prepare separate guidelines tailored for Student Affairs, Extension, and Academic Affairs.
  - c. Change "opportunities for students to learn" to "learning environments and support services for students to learn." That reflects the HLC's language.
  - d. Using the term "sabbatical" could be misleading.
  - e. "Curriculum map" will be jargon to some people.
    - i. Use a non-jargon term like matrix. The matrix should list courses and their learning outcomes. It should specify how the learning is assessed.
    - ii. Outcomes are in the columns and the cells are for the actual evidence. The evidence is showing what you said what you do.
    - iii. Attach a sample of a matrix from one of our departments.
    - iv. Members were asked to give Andersen or Peterson any additional suggestions for the guidelines.
6. Peterson gave a short verbal report on the proposed GE assessment initiative. The GE committee met and is working on a plan to assess a sample student work from the capstones. Peterson will provide more information at the next meeting.

**NEXT MEETING: 9:00, Wednesday, November 6, Peace Garden**